

UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE NUEVO LEÓN
Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Relaciones
Internacionales

Política Exterior de México

PIA

Date: 05/15/22

ID: 1997893

Luis Gerardo Salazar Santos

Throughout history there have been a multiplicity of ways of relating to others; these facts are evident due to our main characteristics as human beings, neuropsychologic predispositions and the way in which we are structured in our psyche is what determines us to be as we are; and for these reasons, we have always tried to find new ways to build links. The human being advanced along with the external conditions that surround him; it is even a very interesting topic how technology and contemporary science have affected our way of being, however, that is not today's topic.

Among these multiple ways of relating, from the point of view of foreign policy, an infinite number of ideas and theories have been proposed on how all groups of human beings (societies-states) should organize themselves, as well as what the legal framework should be.

As already mentioned, from the moment we moved from singular and simple human-human relations to the point of linking ourselves through more complex codes and connections such as the modern state or contemporary society, it has been necessary to create new forms of constitution and bilateral development of world communities.

From a national perspective, after the revolutionary period, multiple political leaders created different theoretical proposals on how to deal with the relationship and foreign policy of Mexico, as well as from an international perspective. There is a considerable number of doctrines such as the Carranza doctrine, the Obregón doctrine, the Estrada doctrine, the Cárdenas doctrine, the Ordaz doctrine, etc. On the other hand, it should be noted that theories and ideologies on foreign policy were also developed and formulated in other countries, each with its own history and the personal background of the state and culture that established the necessary conditions to become what it was.

Nevertheless, of all the doctrines that we mentioned before, today we will specialize in exhaustively analyzing only one of them, which is one of the most relevant in the matter, due to its great similarity and relationship with other global doctrines that strongly influenced international behaviors and attitudes to deeply characterize our institutions and organizations, as well as our principles and laws.

The Estrada Doctrine is the name of the central idea of Mexico's foreign policy since 1930. Its name honors the memory of Genaro Estrada Félix, head of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of that country during the presidency of Pascual Ortiz Rubio. In short, this ideology is positioned against interventionism and supports the idea of self-determination of societies, in addition to emphasizing the importance of national sovereignty within the international spectrum, as well as the relevance of the concept of Freedom.

Next, we will dialectically investigate the pros and cons, the advantages and disadvantages, the positive and negative points of the Estrada doctrine, with the aim of capturing a rigorous analytical proposal that works as an academic framework within the subject of Foreign Policy.

In the first place, to carry out the writing in an orderly and neat way, we will begin by stating the positive points of the Estrada Doctrine, which are truly solid and forceful; even, a large part of the arguments in favor of the doctrine are influenced by political ideologies totally in force today.

One of the most hackneyed and logical justifications of the doctrine is that the fact that national sovereignty is respected, the power of a State to exercise its dominance over its territory, as well as non-intervention in foreign affairs, is that conflicts or misunderstandings between the countries of the world can be easily avoided; all this because there is no violation of the rights of a state, nor imminent danger to national interests, it is redundant to think that controversy could be generated.

It is a matter of looking at the past, and realizing that the reason 1 for historical conflicts has always been for hegemonic reasons in which the intervention and exploitation of man by man is always involved, in order to establish hegemonic power dialectical relations of a master and a slave.

Therefore, as already mentioned, a direct benefit of the doctrine is the possible absence of problems between states due to the respect that would exist for the territory and history of each country, since the recognition of sovereignty and the external homeland would be the elementary concepts in which this argument would turn.

Another argument of an ideological nature, highly politicized within the public debate, is that of the constant variable in the structural systematic organizational mathematical formula, which is the elementary principle of Freedom as a requirement for human development. There is a part of the political spectrum that positions Freedom as a key piece of the human being and of society to achieve a correct and optimal administration; nonetheless, what would be the plausible relationship between the Estrada doctrine and Liberty? Well, the existing connection is the similar effect that originates at the mercy of a similar first cause, which is the ability of an entity to be able to decide its own path without any interference, which will result in great development and national growth.

As long as there are no rules or interventions that delimit or inhibit the pristine behavior of the State, they will originate in the search for the national good and to grow individually, which in a second moment will achieve collective benefit through basic economic means. However, when they intervene in matters foreign to theirs, and seek to influence behavior and direct it towards a path that is not the one indicated for the neo-colonized state, it is most likely that it will regress and undergrow due to not being not working for their own account, but for someone else's account, seeing their Freedom limited, and proportionally also their opportunities to grow at a national level.

Drastically changing direction, we will now discuss the existing negative points within the possibly disadvantageous part of this question. Since we have argued the foundations of the positive part of the Estrada doctrine, it is imperative to mention that there are also good and strong arguments in favor of the opposite pole.

Within the field of psychology, sociology, anthropology and some theories of political philosophy, human relations and how ties are built have been studied, as well as the diversification of roles within the connection itself; the answers to all these questions have been generally very similar, in addition to the fact that historical evidence supports our following assertion, which is that within the links between divergent entities, two positions are unconsciously constituted that determine the substantial character of the relationship: a master and a slave.

The story refers to the exploitation among human beings, seeking hegemony and power over all things, greed being the worst of virtues if we can call it that; being present in each appearance of two or more people the desire to be the master of the other. For these reasons and in a very abstract and conceptual way, the Estrada doctrine hides a negative point that should be highlighted, and that is that due to the "natural" behavior of the human being, it is sometimes necessary to intervene in foreign relations of other countries, violating its sovereignty and the basic principles of international law. All this because in many countries of the world, there are constant violations of human rights, terrorist acts and attacks, as well as repression and discrimination against minorities, among many other things; in appropriate cases, the intervention of a group of States that seek to free from suffering many people who find themselves trapped under dictatorships, failed governments or tyrannies becomes an obligation.

It is essential to highlight the importance of a collective society; that is to say, no human being can develop by himself, and this is the case with countries; no state has the skills and qualities to be self-sufficient. All the people and administrative organizational relationships that are the result of the same connection between them, need a link that makes them live and grow together.

It happens in the same way with the Estrada doctrine; at a certain point, we could affirm that no country requires support and, where appropriate, foreign intervention to safeguard the failed State when it is in the grip of some disaster or systematic failure. It is such a complex debate because what is unknown is where we can draw the dividing line between good and bad. Because it is too negative to say a resounding no, but too liberal to simply say yes. It seems that the debate is polarized to the point of not knowing whether to enter foreign territories to save people from misery, although international conflicts and even probable wars may arise from these actions; or if it is better to pretend that we don't realize it and continue with our lives ignoring the thousands of problems that terrify humanity.

It has become a necessity to ask ourselves if our way of relating to other states is really fruitful, and if the principles of foreign policy and international law serve only to maintain a "stable" world, or a just world. Because fairness goes beyond what we could conceive as human beings indoctrinated and accustomed to the current system; what is fair is a concept that must be reconfigured and readapted to the contemporary context, to think if we are going in the right direction.

On most occasions we believe that the progress of humanity is the ultimate goal of our actions, when in reality progress does not exist as such, since what is gained on one side is lost on the other; and the reality is that since we do not know that we have lost, we believe that we have won when we have not.